

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 13-17 and 31-52 are presently active, Claims 1-12 and 18-30 having been previously canceled without prejudice, and Claims 13, 15-17, 31-37 and 42-49 having been amended. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 13-14 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwasaki (U.S. Pat. No. 5,550,709) in view of Takahira (U.S. Pat. No. 4,960,982). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Iwasaki and Takahira and further in view of Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, page 163, 1993. Claims 31-52 were objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, the Examiner did not consider the reference AO (JP 10-302030) listed on the PTO Form 1449 and submitted in the parent application, indicating that the reference was not present in the PTO files as it “was not scanned if it was received by the Office.” In response, Applicant submits herewith a copy of the reference AO (JP 10-302030) and a copy of the previously submitted PTO 1449 form. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the reference be formally considered and acknowledged, and that the copy of the above-noted PTO Form 1449 properly be initialed and returned to Applicant.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 13-17, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claims 13-17 has been overcome because, in Applicant’s view, amended independent Claims 13 and 16 patentably distinguish over the applied references as discussed below.

The data storage medium recited in Claim 13 comprises a semiconductor memory device having a first memory cell array, a second memory cell array, a first terminal, and a second terminal. Further, Claim 13 recites a first wiring, connected to the first terminal, for controlling data write and erase operations of the first memory cell array, and a second wiring, connected to the second terminal, for controlling a data write operation of the second memory cell array. In contrast, Iwasaki clearly does not disclose the features recited in Claim 13 as stated the outstanding Office Action. The outstanding Office Action looks to Takahira to remedy the deficiencies of Iwasaki. However, Fig.1 of Takahira discloses a semiconductor memory 3 and a mass storage memory 4. The outstanding Office Action further states Fig.1 discloses a connection between #2 and #3 (assumed to be the first wiring) and a connection between #4 and #7 (assumed to be the second wiring). Thus, Takahira fails to teach or suggest a semiconductor memory device having a first memory cell array and a second memory cell array recited in Claim 13. Takahira also fails to teach or suggest a first wiring connected to the first terminal of the semiconductor memory device and a second wiring connected to the second terminal of the semiconductor memory device. Thus, any combination of Iwasaki and Takahira fails to teach or suggest the data storage medium recited in Claim 13.

For Claim 16, the outstanding Office Action also finds Iwasaki fails to disclose the elements recited therein, and Takahira fails to teach or suggest a semiconductor memory device having a first memory cell array and a second memory cell array, and a first wiring connected to the first terminal of the semiconductor memory device and a second wiring connected to the second terminal of the semiconductor memory device.

Accordingly, independent Claims 13 and 16 patentably distinguish over any combination of Iwasaki and Takahira. Therefore, independent Claims 13 and 16 and the pending Claims 14-15 and 17 dependent from Claims 13 and 16 are believed to be allowable.

Application No. 10/669,420

Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2005

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
EHK:TY:clh

CARL E. SCHLIER
REGISTRATION NO. 34,428

I:\atty\TY\AMEND-RESPONSES\0039\242393\am.doc